

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application and stand rejected. Claims 1-12, 14-25, and 30-32 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to the title on the basis that it is not descriptive. The title has been amended to --A SYSTEM FOR RATING OBJECTS ON A NETWORK--.

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. Amendments to the specification are contained herein. Moreover, a substitute Abstract including revisions has been prepared and is submitted herewith. Also submitted herewith is a marked-up copy of the Abstract indicating the changes incorporated therein. No new matter has been added.

Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the basis that the claimed invention is directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claim 32 has been amended to recite that the rating information obtaining program is a computer program recorded on a computer-readable recording medium included in the terminal device.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that there is insufficient antecedent basis for “rating points” as recited in line 3. Claim 30 has been amended to address the Examiner’s concern.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 30 be withdrawn.

The claims have been rejected as indicated below.

Claims 1-4 and 7-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138471) (hereinafter referred to as “Dutta”).

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of common practices in the art.

Independent claims 1, 9, 31 and 32 have been amended to distinguish over the reference cited by the Examiner.

The above rejections are submitted to be inapplicable to the amended claims for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a mutual rating system in which a user rates an object associated with a network, including a plurality of rating information storing terminal devices connected to the network, each rating information storing terminal device having stored therein rating information related to an object previously rated by other users. Moreover, claim 1 recites at least one rating information collecting terminal device for collecting rating information related to a desired object from at least one online rating information storing terminal device, wherein the at least one rating information collecting terminal device includes a rating analyzing section operable to analyze the rating information collected from the at least one rating information storing terminal device and to present an analysis result for the desired object to a user operating the at least one rating information collecting terminal device.

In contrast to the present invention, Dutta does not disclose a plurality of rating information storing terminal devices that each have stored therein rating information related to an object previously rated by other users. Moreover, Dutta does not disclose analyzing the rating information collected from at least one rating information storing terminal device and presenting an analysis result for the desired object to a user operating a rating information collecting terminal device.

Instead, Dutta discloses a peer-to-peer system that rates each file based on the usage of those files (see para. [0060]). For example, an assumption is made that a retrieved file that is used frequently has more value in relation to a retrieved file that is used less frequently. Other assumptions may be made, such as the observation that a retrieved file that is kept for a long period of time has more value in relation to a file that was kept for a shorter period of time (see para. [0058]). The system is used to facilitate successful search queries within a peer-to-peer network and results of the search query are available for a user. Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Dutta to modify the peer-to-peer system such that the search query results are analyzed to present results to a user based on rating information that has been input by other users.

In other words, Dutta does not disclose a mutual rating system in which a user rates an object associated with a network, including, in part, a plurality of rating information storing terminal devices connected to the network, each rating information storing terminal device having stored therein rating information related to an object previously rated by other users. Moreover, claim 1 recites at least one rating information collecting terminal device for collecting rating information related to a desired object from at least one online rating information storing terminal device, wherein the at least one rating information collecting terminal device includes a rating analyzing section operable to analyze the rating information collected from the at least one rating information storing terminal device and to present an analysis result for the desired object to a user operating the at least one rating information collecting terminal device.

For at least the reasons discussed above, it is believed clear that Dutta fails to disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Regarding claims 9, 31 and 32, they are patentable over the references relied upon in the rejections for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of claim 1. That is, each of claims 9, 31 and 32 similarly recite a mutual rating system in which a user rates an object associated with a network, including, in part, a plurality of terminal devices each being connected to the network and having stored therein rating information related objects previously rated by other users. Moreover, claims 9, 31 and 32 similarly recite a rating analyzing section operable to analyze the rating information collected by at least one rating information storing terminal device and to present an analysis result for a desired object to a user operating a rating information collecting terminal device.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is believed clear that claims 1, 9, 31 and 32 are not anticipated by Dutta under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Furthermore, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have found it obvious to modify Dutta under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in such a manner as to result in the invention of claims 1, 9, 31 and 32. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-8 depending therefrom, claim 9 and claims 10-30 depending therefrom, and claims 31 and 32 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tomoyuki HAGA et al.

/Kevin McDermott/  
2008.10.10 14:12:18 -04'00'  
By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin McDermott  
Registration No. 48,113  
Attorney for Applicants

KM/MSH/kh  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
**October 10, 2008**